RL-721 REV 6

## **NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM**

**Document ID Number:** 

DOE/CX-00136

## I. Project Title:

HISTORIC WHITE BLUFFS BANK BUILDING RENOVATION PROJECT

II. Project Description and Location (including Time Period over which proposed action will occur and Project Dimensions - e.g., acres displaced/disturbed, excavation length/depth, area/location/number of buildings, etc.):

This project will renovate the White Bluffs Bank building. The intent is to include the White Bluffs Bank building in seasonal guided public tours of the Hanford Site. The White Bluffs Bank, also known as the First National Bank of White Bluffs and the First Bank of White Bluffs, is a historically significant building. The building is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and is considered a contributing component to the White Bluffs Historic District.

The project includes stabilization of the structure and removal of material that may jeopardize the structural stability of the building. Once the building has been stabilized and the condition evaluated, a renovation plan will be drafted and implemented. The bank building will receive electrical power from existing on-site utilities. This will be accomplished by constructing a 13.8kV power line extension which will tie into the existing line on the west side of Route 2N. The new power line will follow the west side of Route 2N until it intersects Federal Avenue. The power line will be constructed along the southeast side of Federal Ave to replicate the location of the original power line in the town of White Bluffs.

The White Bluffs Bank was constructed in 1907 and incorporated in 1909. The building is a 25-feet by 30-feet by 14-feet high one story concrete block structure located on the main street (Federal Avenue) of the historic town of White Bluffs. The roof is constructed of one-way sloping wood trusses covered with tongue and groove sheathing. The roof is in poor condition with no exterior roofing material present. The floor is constructed of tongue and groove boards attached to wood joists over a shallow crawl space. The floor is in poor condition and in some locations has deteriorated to the point that the crawl space is visible. Exterior walls are constructed of locally manufactured two-piece concrete blocks connected with grout. Parapet walls were topped with a solid block cast concrete cap. The southwest exterior wall has deteriorated to the point that the inner course of concrete blocks is visible in many places. The interior space contains a public banking area, two private offices, and a vault. The vault is located on the southeast wall and the door has been welded shut. The interior walls are plaster and lath construction covered with decorative wallpaper. Decorative wood sills and lintels are present on the interior doors and windows. There is currently no power or water supply to the bank building.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project is approximately 4.14 acres in size. The APE comprises the area required for construction activities to stabilize the facility and install utilities as described above. All excavation and ground disturbance will remain within the APE. Access to the project area will be through existing graveled/paved roadways, parking lots, and walkways.

An ecological resources survey (ECR-2013-600-011) of the project area was conducted on February 8, 2013, and additional nighttime surveys for bats were performed on May 6, 2013 and June 3, 2013. The area surrounding the bank was highly disturbed prior to creation of the Hanford Site. The vegetation is recovering and the dominant native plant species are Sandberg's bluegrass, sand dropseed, and gray rabbitbrush. Cheatgrass is also common and remnants of former human occupation include black locust and matrimony vine. Signs of pocket gopher, elk, mule deer, and coyote were observed. Acoustic bat monitoring revealed a moderate level of bat activity with several species including pallid bats, silver-haired bats, little brown bats, hoary bats, and others. Two locations appeared to be used for roosting; the inside of the southeast wall and in a crack in the chimney. Because the roosting sites may eventually be lost when the building is restored, one or more bat boxes will be installed or design features included in the restoration design to allow for continued use of the site by bats. The boxes will be placed as early in the restoration process as possible to allow bats to find the new habitat prior to the building being completely sealed.

No plant or animal species protected under the Endangered Species Act, candidates for such protection, or species listed by the Washington State government as threatened or endangered were observed in the vicinity of the project area. There is a potential for birds to nest within the project area on the ground, on buildings, or equipment. The nesting season is typically from mid-March to mid-July. The active nests of migratory birds

## **NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM (continued)**

Document ID Number:

DOE/CX-00136

(containing eggs or young) are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The MBTA makes it illegal for people to "take" migratory birds, their eggs, feathers, or nests. Take is defined in the MBTA to include by any means or in any manner, any attempt at hunting, pursuing, wounding, killing, possessing, or transporting any migratory bird, nest, egg, or part thereof. Personnel working on this project will be instructed to watch for nesting birds. If any nesting birds (if not a nest, a pair of birds of the same species or a single bird that will not leave the area when disturbed) are encountered or suspected, or bird defensive behaviors (flying at workers, refusal to leave the area, strident vocalizations) are observed within the project area, then an Ecological Resource Specialist will be contacted to evaluate the situation. A nesting bird survey will be conducted prior to beginning ground clearing activities during the nesting season. All project personnel will be reminded to drive and park vehicles and equipment within previously disturbed areas that are devoid of vegetation to the greatest extent possible. No adverse impacts are anticipated from project activities if these recommendations are followed.

A Cultural Resources Review (CRR) (HCRC-2013-600-011) of the project area was conducted. An APE notification was sent to the Washington State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and regional Tribes on January, 14, 2013. A cultural resources survey was conducted on March 1, 2013. Multiple features associated with archaeological site 45BN1095 and the White Bluffs Historic District were identified within the APE. A CRR, with a finding of "No Adverse Effect to Historic Properties," was prepared and submitted to the SHPO and area Tribes for a 30-day comment period on March 22, 2013. The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE/RL), provided a notice of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for this project on May 20, 2013. The preparation of the CRR included a literature review, geomorphologic review, and archaeological field work. The archaeological field work identified that components of the White Bluffs Historic District and archaeological site 45BN1095 are present within the APE. Work controls have been recommended for project activities that will take place within the culturally sensitive area. All work will be conducted by Architectural/Engineering professionals with specialized experience in historic renovation/preservation following the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings." If the recommended work controls are followed the project will not cause an adverse effect to historic properties. Based on the results of the Section 106 Review the project, as proposed, will result in a finding of "No Adverse Effect to Historic Properties."

Although no cultural resources are expected, there is the potential to discover subsurface archaeological deposits. Full time monitoring by a Cultural Resources Specialist during ground disturbing activities within the White Bluffs town site and archaeological site 45BN1095 will be conducted. Although no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated, all workers will be directed to watch for cultural materials (e.g., bones, stone tools, mussel shell, cans, bottles, etc.) during all work activities. If any cultural materials are encountered, work in the vicinity of the discovery will stop until a Cultural Resources Specialist has been contacted, the significance of the find assessed, appropriate Tribes notified, and if necessary, arrangements made for mitigation of the find.

The proposed action is addressed by 10 CFR 1021, subpart D, appendix B, categorical exclusion (CX) B3.14, "Small-Scale Educational Facilities" that covers "siting, construction, modification, operation, and decommissioning of small-scale educational facilities (including, but not limited to, conventional teaching laboratories, libraries, classroom facilities, auditoriums, museums, visitor centers, exhibits, and associated offices) within or contiguous to a previously disturbed or developed area (where active utilities and currently used roads are readily accessible)."

Portions of the proposed action are also addressed by 10 CFR 1021, subpart D, appendix B, CX B4.12, "Construction of Powerlines" that covers "construction of electric powerlines approximately 10 miles in length or less, or approximately 20 miles in length or less within previously disturbed or developed powerline or pipeline rights-of-way."

This is an activity-specific application of CX B3.14. Similar future projects will require separate NEPA review and approval by the DOE-RL NEPA Compliance Officer.

RL-721 REV 6			Document ID Number:				
KEV 0	NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM (continued)		DOE/CX-00136				
III. Reviews (if applicable	e):				desired to the control of the control of the		
iological Review Report #: ECR-2013-600-011; Letter MSA-1302414 dated June 10, 2013							
Cultural Review Report #: HCRC-2013-600-011; Letter MSA-1302414 dated June 10, 2013							
Additional Attachments:							
IV. Existing NEPA Documentation YES NO							
Is the proposed action evaluated in a previous EA, EIS, or under CERCLA?					$\boxtimes$		
If "NO," proceed to Section V. If "YES," List EA, EIS, or CERCLA Document(s) Title and Number:							
Not Applicable							
And then complete Section VI. Provide electronic copy of Initiator/ECO signed NRSF to DOE NCO for information only. DOE NCO signature is not required.							
V. Categorical Exclusion					NO		
Does the proposed action fall within a class of actions that is listed in Appendixes A or B to Subpart D of 10 CFR Part 1021?							
Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?					$\boxtimes$		
Is the proposal connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts or result in cumulatively significant impacts (not precluded by 40 CFR 1506.1 or 10 CFR 1021.211)?							
List CX to be applied and complete Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements (where an action might fit within multiple CXs, use the CX that best fits the proposed action):							
10 CFR 1021, subpart D, appendix B, CX B3.14, "Small-Scale Educational Facilities"							
Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements					NO		
Does the proposed action threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environmental, safety, or health, including DOE and/or Executive Orders?					$\boxtimes$		
Does the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?					$\boxtimes$		
Does the proposed action disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases?							
Does the proposed action adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources?					$\boxtimes$		
Does the proposed action involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species such that the action is NOT contained or confined in a manner designed, operated, and conducted in accordance to applicable requirements to prevent unauthorized release into the environment?					$\boxtimes$		
If "NO" to all Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements questions above, complete Section VI, and provide to DOE NCO for final Approval/Determination and signature in Section VII.							
If "YES" to any of the Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements questions above, contact DOE NCO for additional NEPA Review.							
VI. Responsible Contractor Signatures							
	Name (Printed)	Signature		Date			
Initiator	Jerry W. Cammann, MSA NEPA-SME	Jury W. Camn	nann	7/22/	13		
Cognizant Environmental Compliance Officer		•					

RL-721 REV 6		Document ID Number:				
THE V	NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM (continued)	DOE/CX-00136				
VII. Approval/Determination	·					
DOE NEPA Compliance Officer:	Clifford E. Clark, NEPA Compliance Officer (NC	0)				
Based on my review of information conveyed to me and in my possession (or attached) concerning the proposed action, as NEPA Compliance Officer (as authorized under DOE Order 451.1B), I have determined that the proposed action fits within the specified class of action:						
NCO Determination -	EA EIS	/				
Signature:	1666 Date: 1/2°	4/2013				
1	7	<del>- / -</del>				